UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,847	03/03/2004	Youenn Fablet	01807.101570.	2498

5514   7590   12/30/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
1290 Avenue of the Americas
NEW YORK, NY 10104-3800

EXAMINER
ZAHR, ASHRAF A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2175	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
12/30/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<table>
<tr><td rowspan="4">Office Action Summary</td><td>Application No.
10/790,847</td><td>Applicant(s)
FABLET, YOUENN</td></tr>
<tr><td>Examiner</td><td>Art Unit</td></tr>
<tr><td>ASHRAF ZAHR</td><td>2175</td></tr>
</table>

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 October 2009</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-10,12-14 and 16-24</u> is/are pending in the application.

   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-6,8-10,12-14 and 16-24</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

   a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

   1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

   2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

   3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/8/2009</u>.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

10/8/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-14, 16-24 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1-6, 8-10, 12-13, 16-17, 19-20, 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Stawikowski, US 7,159,007 (Hereinafter, Stawikowski) in

view of Dani, et al. US 7,386,860 (Hereinafter, Dani).

Regarding Claim 1, Stawikowski discloses "method of offering a service provided by a server computer in a communication network comprising sending, from a server computer that provides a service to a client computer, a service description document in a language for describing web services". Specifically, the communication system described in this invention uses a service description document 61 offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "which is independent of any client or user characteristic, defining the type of data exchanged between said server and any client when said service is executed". Specifically, that describes the capabilities of one or several WEB services 21, 21' on automation equipment 10, in other words that .describes the WEB services that automation equipment 10 is capable of supplying or offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "the service description document comprising a description defining the type, content and sequencing of data exchanged between said server and any client when said service is executed". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Stawikowski also discloses "and a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or post-processing of data in XML format of a message exchanged during the execution of said service on the communication network". Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform with a service description language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol

and providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams defined by the

W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Stawikowski also discloses "wherein the description of said processing

functionality comprises a list of properties supported by said processing functionality,

said properties defining at least respectively, the node in the communication network

adapted to execute said processing, and the type of processing". Specifically, a service

description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of

parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Dani also discloses "wherein the description of said processing functionality

comprises a property adapted to specify whether the processing to be carried out is

obligatory or optional". Specifically, an optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to

combine Dani with Stawikowski to include optional extensions. The motivation do so

would be to include additional information in the service reference (Dani, col 24, ln 55-

60).

Regarding Claim 2, Stawikowski also discloses "wherein said processing

functionality defines processings adapted to produce or use data in XML format defined

in a first abstract part of a service description document". Specifically, a the service

description document 61 is conform with a service description language referring to the

SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol and providing grammar based on the

XML language or XML diagrams defined by the W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Regarding Claim 3, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 2,

wherein the description of said processing functionality is inserted in said first abstract

part of the service description document". pecifically, a message representing an

abstract definition of a transmitted data type (for example string, boolean, etc. . . .). A

WSDL binding is conform with the WSDL language and is based on the XML language.

(Stawikowski, col 2, In 50-55).

Regarding Claim 4, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said preprocessing or said post-processing is implemented via a script

language". Specifically, JAVA servlet, a JSP application, an ASP application, etc. All or

some of this computer application 31 is generated and deployed 52 by means of a

development application 41 (Stawikowski, col 5ln 8-15).

Regarding Claim 5, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said processing functionality is defined as a data item in XML format in a first

abstract part of a service description document".   Specifically, a message representing

an abstract definition of a transmitted data type (for example string, boolean, etc. . . .).

A WSDL binding is conform with the WSDL language and is based on the XML

language. (Stawikowski, col 2, In 50-55).

Regarding Claim 6, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 5, wherein said data item in XML format defining said processing functionality is encoded in a second concrete part of the service description document". Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform with a service description language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or HTTPS protocol and providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams defined by the W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).

Regarding Claim 8, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify whether said processing is carried out on the sending or reception of said message". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 9, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1, wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to specify the message or a set of messages to which said processing applies". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 10, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein said processing functionality also comprises a property adapted to define the

data produced or used by said processing, and possibly the type of said data".

Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request

name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 –

col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 12, Stawikowski also discloses "method according to Claim 1,

wherein, for at least one property supported by said processing functionality, the

description of said processing functionality comprises a list of values attributable to said

property". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests

(request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5,

ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Regarding Claim 13, Stawikowski also discloses "method of testing access to a

service by a client computer in a communication network, from a service description

document, comprising the following steps implemented by said client computer".

Specifically, the communication system described in this invention uses a service

description document 61 offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "extracting from said service description, provided by

a server computer offering a said service, document a description of a processing

functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML

format of a message exchanged during the execution of the service on the

communication network". Specifically, a the service description document 61 is conform

with a service description language referring to the SOAP protocol or to the HTTP or

HTTPS protocol and providing grammar based on the XML language or XML diagrams

defined by the W3C.) (Stawikowski, col 6, ln 5-10).Stawikowski also discloses "reading,

from the extracted description of said processing functionality, a value associated with a

property adapted to specify a node in the communication network adapted to execute

the processing". Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of

requests (request name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes)

(Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Dani also discloses "reading, from the extracted description of said processing

functionality, a value of a property adapted to specify whether the must be executed by

the client computer". Specifically, an optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

Dani also discloses "verifying whether the processing is supported by the client

computer in the communication network when said processing is obligatory and must be

executed by said client computer in the communication network". Specifically, an

optional extensions field (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60). It would be obvious to one of ordinary

skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine Dani with Stawikowski to include

optional extensions. The motivation do so would be to include additional information in

the service reference (Dani, col 24, ln 55-60).

Regarding Claim 16, applicant claims a device with the means for performing

the method in claim 1. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 1 and is

therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 17, applicant claims a device with the means for performing

the method in claim 13. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 13 and

is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

Regarding Claim 19, Stawikowski also discloses a "server computer in a

communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of

offering a service according to Claim 1" (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 9-16).

Regarding Claim 20, Stawikowski also discloses "client computer in a

communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of testing

access according to Claim 13" (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 9-16).

Regarding Claim 22, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on

which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of offering a

service according to Claim 1". This claim is substantially similar to claim 1 and is

therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 1.

Regarding Claim 23, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of testing access according to Claim 13". This claim is substantially similar to claim 13 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 13.

5. Claims 14, 18, 21, 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stawikowski, US 7,159,007 (Hereinafter, Stawikowski) in view of Lonnroth et al., US 6,826,597 (Hereinafter, Lonnroth).

Regarding Claim 14, Stawikowski also discloses "method of validating a message received by an intermediate computer in a communication network, from a service description document comprising a description of a processing functionality implemented during a preprocessing or the post-processing of data in XML format of the message exchanged during the execution of a service on the communication network". Specifically, The communication system described in this invention uses a service description document 61 that describes the capabilities of one or several WEB services 21 (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 35-40).

Stawikowski also discloses "acquiring the message at the intermediate computer". Specifically, intermediate equipment operatively connected to the automation equipment and the remote equipment (Stawikowski, claim 19).

Stawikowski also discloses "extracting from the service description document, the description of a service associated with the document". Specifically, that describes

the capabilities of one or several WEB services 21, 21' on automation equipment 10, in

other words that describes the WEB services that automation equipment 10 is capable

of supplying or offering (Stawikowski, col 5,ln 35-45).

Stawikowski also discloses "extracting a processing from the message received".

Specifically, a service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request

name, nature and name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 –

col 6, ln 5).

Stawikowski also discloses "acquiring from said service description document at

least one imperative value associated with a property of the processing". Specifically, a

service description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and

name of parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Stawikowski also discloses "verifying whether said imperative value is included in

a list of values which can be attributed to a property supported by said processing

functionality described in the service description document".   Specifically, a service

description document 61 specifies a set of requests (request name, nature and name of

parameters, request attributes) (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 65 – col 6, ln 5).

Lonnroth also discloses "reading the value associated with a property adapted to

specify whether the processing is executed before or after the sending of said

message". Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in

response to a service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The

XML request document includes links that identify the information sources that

correspond to the requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter,

the XML document may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that

is used by the various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

Lonnroth also discloses "executing said processing when said value is adapted

to specify that the processing must be executed before the sending of the message".

Specifically, the XML document generated by pre-processor 240 in response to a

service request is referred to herein as a XML request document. The XML request

document includes links that identify the information sources that correspond to the

requested service. As shall be described in greater detail hereafter, the XML document

may also include metadata, inserted by the pre-processor 240, that is used by the

various components of post processor 244 (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 30-52).

It would be obvious to one or ordinary skill at the time of the invention to combine

Lonnroth with Stawikowski. The motivation to do so would be to determine whether the

client issuing the request is authorized to issue the request (Lonnroth, col 5, ln 25-30).

Regarding Claim 18, applicant claims a device with the means for performing

the method in claim 14. This claim is substantially similar to the method of claim 14 and

is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Regarding Claim 21, Stawikowski also discloses a "computer in a

communication network, comprising means adapted to implement the method of

validating a message according to Claim 14" (Stawikowski, col 5, ln 9-16).

Regarding Claim 24, applicant claims a "computer-readable storage medium on which is stored a computer executable program to implement the method of validating a message according to Claim 14". This claim is substantially similar to claim 14 and is therefore rejected based upon the same reasoning used to reject claim 14.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ASHRAF ZAHR whose telephone number is (571)270-1973. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30 am - 6 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Bashore can be reached on (571)272-4088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AAZ 12/18/2009

Ting Lee
/Ting Lee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2173